UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN MICHIGAN

MICHAEL LYNN,			
Plaintiff,	Casa No. 1,10 av 00020		
v.	Case No. 1:19-cv-00039		
··	Hon. Paul L. Maloney		
CITY OF LANSING,	·		
Defendant.			
Batey Law Firm, PLLC	Plunkett Cooney		
SCOTT P. BATEY (P54711)	RHONDA STOWERS (P64083)		
Attorney for Plaintiff	Attorney for Defendant		
30200 Telegraph Road, Suite 400	Plaza One Financial Center		
Bingham Farms, MI 48025	111 E. Court Street, Suite 1B		
(248) 540-6800-telephone	Flint, MI 48502		
(248) 540-6814-fax	(810) 342-7003-telephone		
sbatey@bateylaw.com	(810) 232-3159-fax		
	rstowers@plunkettcooney.com		
	City of Lansing AMANDA KATHRYN O'BOYLE (P81925) 124 W. Michigan Avenue, 5 th Floor		
	Lansing, MI 48933		
	aoboyle@lansingmi.gov		
V	ERDICT FORM		
We, the jury, make the following answers to the questions submitted by the Court:			
Hostile Work Environment			
1. Was plaintiff subjected to a hostile	work environment based on race in violation of Title		
VII after June 6, 2017 and later?			
Yes No			
(Go to the next question)			

2.	Was plaintiff subjected to a hostile work environment based on race in violation of the
	Elliott-Larsen Civil Rights Act after January 18, 2016?
	Yes No
	(If you answered yes to either Question 1 or Question 2, continue to Question 3. If
	you answered no to both Questions, skip to Question 5)
3.	Was defendant legally responsible for a hostile work environment?
	Yes No
	(If you answered yes, continue to the next Question. If you answered no, skip to
	Question 5)
7.	Did the plaintiff suffer any damages as a result of being subjected to a hostile work environment based on race? Yes No (Go to the next question)
	First Amendment
5.	Did the Defendant, acting under the color of state law, intentionally take adverse
a	ction that would deter a person of ordinary firmness from continuing to engage in that
sį	peech against the plaintiff?
	Yes No
	(If you answered yes, continue to the next question. If you answered no, skip to
	Question 10)

6.	Was the plaintiff's speech a substantial or motivating factor for the adverse action?
	Yes No
	(If you answered yes, continue to the next question. If you answered no, skip to
	Question 10)
7.	Was the adverse action a proximate cause of damages to plaintiff?
	Yes No
	(If you answered yes, continue to the next question. If you answered no, skip to
	Question 10)
8.	Would the defendant have taken the same action regardless of plaintiff's speech?
	Yes No
	(If you answered yes, continue to the next question. If you answered no, skip to
	Question 10)
9.	Was a custom, policy, regulation or practice of the City of Lansing the proximate
cause	of retaliatory action taken against the plaintiff?
	Yes No
	(If you answered yes, continue to the next question. If you answered no, skip to
	Question 10)

Damages

10.	(Answer this question only if you answered yes to Question 4; otherwise skip	to			
Quest	Question 11)				
	We find Plaintiff's damages for his Hostile Work Environment claims as defined	to			
	be:				
	\$·				
11.	(Answer this question only if you answered yes to Question 9)				
	We find Plaintiff's damages under his First Amendment retaliation claims as defin	ıed			
	to be:				
	\$·				
Dotad	Jury Foreperson				
Dateu:	l:				
Open.185	3566.90382.29610249-2				